

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING D	ATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,070	02/12/2002		Rajesh Kumar Varma	GLS-021	6677
7590 09/26/2005			EXAMINER		
Alfred D. Lot	o, Esq.,		MULLIS, JEFFREY C		
LOBO & CO.,					D + DED > II I + DED
933 The Leade	r Bulding		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
526 Superior A	venue		1711		
Cleveland, OH	44114-140	1	DATE MAILED: 09/26/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		T	
		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		10/074,070	VARMA
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Jeffrey C. Mullis	1711
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the major available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vere to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDON	ON. imely filed  m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 Ju	uly 2005.	
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	s action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowar		
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	153 O.G. 213.
Dispositi	ion of Claims		
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-11,13-18 and 20-22 is/are per 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,2,4,6-11,13-18 and 20-22 is/are rejection claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Applicati	ion Papers		
_	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.	
•	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	is have been received. Is have been received in Application In the second secon	tion No ved in this National Stage
Attachment	tie)		
_	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	y (PTO-413)
2)  Notice 3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail D	Date Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/074,070

Art Unit: 1711

Applicants are requested to delete the entire partial sentence at page 7 line 12 "For compliance ...phone" since it appears to be irrelevant and makes no sense.

Claims 1, 2. 4, 6-11 and 13-18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "polymono(lower) olefin" in the independent claims is unclear in that "lower" is subjective.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Vermeire et al. (US 5,278,220). See the previous Office action at the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 et seq.

Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vermeire et al., cited above.

See the prvious Office action at the last complete paragraph on page 4 et seq.

Applicant's arguments filed 7-5-05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With re to the range of 2-4 carbon atoms, the specification merely says these are "preferably" used not that they are to be viewed as "lowerA". Conceivably by "lower" applicants could have meant 2-6 carbon atoms but that the narrower 2-4 carbon atom range was preferred.

With re to Vermeire, unpatented claims are given their broadest reasonable interpretation and even assuming for the sake of argument that full weight should be given to "sealant" this term can referrer to anything capable of sealing uder any circumstances. In fact a cable coating such as is disclosed by the patent can be viewed as sealing the cable against the elements even including the materials present in the patent which are not recited by the claims. The issue of the problem solved by patentees is irrelevant to anticipation. With re to applicants argument that "there would have to be a suggestion that the disk be held within a bottle cap" is irrelevant where the claims are not drawn to disk/bottle cap combimnation or a process of sealing a bottle. Applicants argue that the term consiting essentially of excludes plasticizer other than polybutene oil, but this allegation is applicants burden to prove. The term "consisting essentially of" only excludes those materials which materially affect the novel and basic characteristics of a composition and it is applicants' burden to prove that such characteristics are changed by the presence of additional materials recited in a prior art product. Note In re Janakirama-Rao, 317 F. 2d 951, 137 USPQ 893 (CCPA 1963) and In re De Lajarte, 337 F. 2d 870, 143 USPQ 256 (CCPA 1964) in this regard.

Claims <u>7-9,11,13 and 14</u> objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 1711

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

JCM

9-19-05

Jeffrey Mullis Primary Examiner Ad Unit 1711